

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1-40 are rejected. Applicants hereby amend claims 3, 14, and 37. Applicants also cancel claim 38.

Claims 3 and 14 stand objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended claims 3 and 14 to overcome the informalities.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-13, 15-31, 33-38, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,581,040 to Wright et. al. (hereinafter "Wright").

Wright discloses a system for providing enhanced communications for the managing of projects, particularly to project communications involving multiple resource providers (Abstract). In Wright, project owners post specifications, which define a proposed project, on a resource system database. (col. 4, lines 39-42). Once resource providers bid on the project, the project owner can then select a winning bid for the project. (col. 4, lines 56-59).

Wright does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 1. Claim 1 recites "a settlement function for tracking expenditures on a project." The Office Action cites col. 2, lines 22-24 and col. 9, lines 46-53 in Wright to teach the above limitation in claim 1. Col. 2, lines 22-24 in Wright disclose a general contractor getting a good estimate for a project. Col. 9, lines 46-53 in Wright disclose price quotations for a bid for a future project. Applicants fail to see how these cited portions of Wright teach tracking expenditures for a project already underway. Instead, these cited portions of Wright teach obtaining estimates, quotes, and bids for a project to be undertaken and not tracking

expenditures for a project in process. Furthermore, the Office Action recites that “the system [of Wright] discloses tracking expenditures on a project in order for a resource provider to formulate a quote for the project.” This statement seems illogical because a quote for a project is accepted prior to expenditures for a project being incurred. Absent a teaching in Wright of a settlement function for tracking expenditures on a project, claim 1 is allowable over Wright.

Claim 1 also recites a “resource management module comprising a work journal function for collecting information about the activity of an individual contractor.” The Office Action recites col. 10, lines 26-36 and 43-48, and col. 12, lines 13-20 in Wright to teach this claim limitation of claim 1. Applicants fail to see how these cited portions of Wright teach or suggest collecting information about the activity of an individual contractor. Instead, these cited portions of Wright teach geographic service area preferences, history of past jobs, capabilities, specifications, bid statuses, and interest posting, which do not teach a work journal function for collecting information about activities of the individual contractor as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Wright for at least the above stated reasons.

Claim 19 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2 and 20 are dependent on claims 1 or 19 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 19.

Claims 3 and 21 are dependent on claims 1 or 19 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 19. Additionally, Wright does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 3. Applicants fails to see how the cited portions (col. 4, lines 39-42 and 54-59; col. 9, line 67-col. 10, line 2) of Wright teach or suggest a

purchase order function for generating a purchase order in response to an approved work order, as recited in claim 3. Furthermore, Applicants fails to see how the cited portions (col. 1, lines 28-31; col. 2, line 64-col.3, line 4; col. 3, lines 57-64; col. 4, lines 20-31 and 56-59) of Wright teach or suggest a risk management function for monitoring compliance with government rules and regulations, as recited in claim 3. Absent any teaching of purchase orders and monitoring compliance with government rules and regulations, claim 3 and 21 are allowable over Wright for at least the above stated reasons.

Claims 4 and 22 are dependent on claims 1 or 19 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 19. Additionally, the cited portions of Wright (col. 2, lines 22-24; col. 9, lines 46-53) do not teach or suggest an expense reporting function as recited in claim 4.

Claims 5-8 and 23-26 are dependent on claims 1 or 19 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 19.

Claims 9 and 27 are dependent on claims 1 or 19 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 19. Additionally, claim 9 recites the contractor entering data into a work journal entity, wherein the entered data comprises hours worked, type of work done, and comments regarding work done. The cited portions (col. 10, lines 26-36 and 43-48; col. 11, lines 43-48; col. 12, lines 13-20) of Wright disclose project specifications, resource provider capabilities, and bids. These cited portions of Wright relate to forming a bid. Applicants fail to see how the cited portions of Wright teach or suggest hours worked, type of work done, and comments regarding work done, which all relate to the work done after bids are accepted. Thus, claim 9 and 27 are allowable over Wright for at least the above stated reasons.

Claims 10-11 and 28-29 are dependent on claims 1 or 19 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 19.

Claims 12-13 and 30-31 are dependent on claims 3 or 21 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3 and 21.

Claims 15 and 33 are dependent on claims 3 or 21 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3 and 21.

Claims 16-18 and 34-36 are dependent on claims 1 or 19 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 19.

Claim 37 has been amended to include the claim limitations of claim 38. Claim 38 has been cancelled. Wright does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of amended claim 37. Amended claim 37 recites “maintaining a work journal for the at least one contractor, including automatically updating work journal, using data input by the at least one contractor and at least one supervisor of the at least one contractor regarding job performance of the at least one contractor.” Applicants fail to see how the cited portion of Wright (col. 10, lines 26-36 and 43-48; col. 11, lines 43-48; col. 12, lines 13-20) teach or suggest using data input regarding job performance of the at least one contractor. Thus, claim 37 is allowable over Wright.

Claim 40 is dependent on claim 37 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 37.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14, 32, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,581,040 to Wright et. al. (“Wright”).

Claims 14, 32, and 39 are dependent on claims 1, 19, or 37 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, 19, and 37. Additionally, since Wright does not teach or suggest project management after a bid is selected, the system in Wright could not determine when is a project is completed to generate an invoice.

Thus, claims 1-37 and 39-40 are allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-37 and 39-40.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, this application is in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow this application. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the number below if he has any questions or if there are remaining outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher L. Wong et. al.

Date: 10/13/04

By: Eugene G. Kim

Eugene G. Kim, Reg. No. 46,267
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, California 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444